EAST CHICAGO WATERWAY MANAGEMENT
DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING
City of East Chicago, Engineering/Annex Building
4444 Railroad Ave.
East Chicago, Indiana
January 21, 2015
Wednesday, 5:00 P.M.

Transcript of the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter, on the 21st day of January, 2015, at 5:00 p.m., at the City of East Chicago, Engineering/Annex Building, 4444 Railroad Avenue, East Chicago, Indiana, before Dawn M. Iseminger, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public for the County of Porter, State of Indiana.

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	MR JOHN FEKETE, President
4	MR. HENRY RODRIGUEZ, Secretary
5	MR. RAY LOPEZ, Treasurer/Financial Officer
6	MR. JOHN BAKOTA, Board Member
7	MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ, Board Member
8	MR. FERNANDO TREVINO, FMT Consulting
9	MS. ELLEN GREGORY, East Chicago Waterway Board of
10	Directors' Attorney
11	
12	Also Present:
13	JIM WESCOTT, Tetra Tech
14	TIM ANDERSON, CliftonLarsonAllen
15	NATALIE MILLS, USACE
16	DAVID ALONZO, BMO Harris Bank
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	2

1	MR. FEKETE: I'd like to call to order the
2	meeting of the East Chicago Waterway Management
3	Board of Directors. Today's date is January 21,
4	2015, and the time is 5:03. First order of
5	business is the call to order. John Bakota?
6	MR. BAKOTA: Here.
7	MR. FEKETE: Henry Rodriguez?
8	MR. HENRY RODRIGUEZ: Here.
9	MR. FEKETE: Patrick Rodriguez?
10	MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: Here.
11	MR. FEKETE: Ted Zagar?
12	(No response.)
13	MR. FEKETE: Ray Lopez?
14	MR. LOPEZ: Present.
15	MR. FEKETE: John Fekete, here Kevin Doyle?
16	(No response.)
17	MR. FEKETE: We have a quorum. The next
18	order is the Consulting Engineering Report. FMT
19	Consulting, Mr. Trevino.
20	MR. TREVINO: Yes. Fernando Trevino, with
21	FMT Consulting. I'd like to start off by going
22	over the contents of your board packet. You have
23	the board minutes for the meeting on December 17,
24	2014. You have a 2014 budget amendment proposal
25	dated January 21, 2015. You have a letter from

IDEM dated January 20, 2015, approving the budget amendment that we are requesting. You have the CliftonLarsonAllen financial statements dated December 31st, 2014, which is actually a typo; so I'll let Tim clarify that.

You have in your packet the claim docket that's on the agenda for approval consideration dated January 21st, 2015. You have First Merchant bank statements for account ending in 608 and 616 for the month of December 2014.

You have in your packet account statements from People's Bank, account ending in 47 and 46, for the month of December 2014.

You have the ECI Facility Trust report from BMO Harris Bank dated January 21st, 2015; and BMO Harris Bank account statement for account ending in 761 for the month December 2014.

You have a summary of outreach activities for the community relations plan for the Great Lakes Legacy Act dated January 21, 2015, and interview questionnaire for the board regarding same. You have in your packet a draft of the community engagement plan for the Grand Cal' River and the Indiana harbor ship canal, dated

January 2015.

2.3

You have in your packet the Tetra Tech report for the Great Lakes Legacy Act Project, dated January 9th, 2015.

You have the Army Corps of Engineer board report, dated January 20th, 2015.

And last but not least, you have Attorney Ellen Gregory's report to the board dated January 21st, 2014,

MS. GREGORY: Whoops.

MR. TREVINO: With a revision date of January 20th, 2015. That concludes the report.

The contents of your packet, just to go over a couple of items. The 2015 user fee invoices I anticipate going out within the next couple weeks. Great Lakes Legacy Act project access agreements have been secured with the city and the park parcels. We'll be working on securing access agreement with the School City of East Chicago.

Work and discussion on the community stakeholder engagement process continues; and draft of the plan, as I mentioned, is in your packet. Cheryl Vaccarello of Tetra Tech will be presenting a summary of the plan today.

Also, been working on our work-in-kind report to the EPA, and I plan to meet with EPA to review the proposal in the next week or so.

As I mentioned, the Tetra Tech's project report is in your packet. Also, we've been working on various funding options for the remediation phase of the project. We anticipate a conference call to discuss strategies in the next week or two. Jim Wescott of Tetra Tech will provide a more detailed update on the Great Lakes Legacy Act project.

Natalie Mills of the Corps will give an update on the Corps' project, and Attorney Ellen Gregory will update us on legal matters.

Some of the regular meetings that I've been participating and representing the district include the BP bi-weekly meetings; Great Lakes Legacy Act project team meetings; the Roxanna development meetings with the EPA, city, and other stakeholders; the dredging project meetings; and canal oil response meetings.

That concludes my report. I mentioned earlier that the date of that financial report

1	may be off, but I think that's the right date,
2	December 31st, 2014. That concludes my report.
3	MR. FEKETE: Any questions?
4	(No response.)
5	MR. FEKETE: Thank you very much. I'd like
6	to entertain a motion for the approval of the
7	board meeting notes for the last meeting, which
8	was December 17, 2014.
9	MR. BAKOTA: Motion to accept.
10	MR. FEKETE: We have a motion. Do we have a
11	second?
12	MR. HENRY RODRIGUEZ: Second.
13	MR. FEKETE: We have a second. Any
14	questions?
15	(No response)
16	MR. FEKETE: All in favor signify aye.
17	(All signify aye).
18	MR. FEKETE: Any opposition?
19	(No response.)
20	MR. FEKETE: The next order is the budget
21	amendment approval consideration for our board
22	action. Did you want to
23	MR. TREVINO: Yes. The line item that we're
24	requesting a budget amendment is for the
25	transcripts/court reporter. The 2014 budget that
- 1	7

16

19 20

21 2.2

24

2.3

25

was used was when Mary Slafendorf was working for us, and since then we've gone with the company of Iseminger & Associates, and based on the December invoice, the budget was over by \$90. consulting with Tim Anderson, we thought it would be a good idea to transfer a thousand just in case there's any unforeseen other issues or invoices, and the money would come from the third party contractor consultants; so that line item would be reduced by a thousand. The net impact on the overall budget would be zero. And, as I mentioned, the proposed amendment has already been forwarded to IDEM, and we have their concurrence to transfer the \$1,000 as mentioned.

MR. FEKETE: I'll entertain a motion to approve the amendment as described.

MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: So moved.

MR. FEKETE: Do I have a second?

MR. HENRY RODRIGUEZ: Second.

MR. FEKETE: We have a motion and a second. Any questions?

MR. LOPEZ: Are we taking it from -- putting a thousand dollars in there but the next year's == this year's budget is going to have to make a change?

1	MR. TREVINO: No. The 2015 budget was based
2	on the current rates that
3	MR. LOPEZ: We're putting another thousand in
4	there to make up the difference for 2014?
5	MR. TREVINO: Yeah, that's for 2014. Yeah.
6	So the amendment does not impact the 2015 budget
7	It's just for the 2014 budget.
8	MR. LOPEZ: Okay. Where are we getting the
9	thousand dollars from?
10	MR. TREVINO: It's coming from, if you look
11	at
12	MR. FEKETE: The money wasn't spent in the
13	other account.
14	MR. TREVINO: Yeah, there was money left over
15	in the line item.
16	MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: Right there
17	(indicating).
18	MR. LOPEZ: I see it now. Okay. Make this
19	bigger for me (indicating).
20	MR. FEKETE: The two yellow lines. Are you
21	okay now?
22	MR. LOPEZ: Yeah. Next time, can you make it
23	bigger?
24	MR. FEKETE: Any other discussion?
25	(No response.)
	9

1	MR. FEKETE: Roll call vote. John Bakota?
2	MR. BAKOTA: Yes.
3	MR. FEKETE: Henry Rodriguez?
4	MR. HENRY RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
5	MR. FEKETE: Patrick Rodriguez?
6	MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
7	MR. FEKETE: Ray Lopez?
8	MR. LOPEZ: Yes.
9	MR. FEKETE: John Fekete, and I vote yes.
10	Ted Zagar?
11	(No response.)
12	MR. FEKETE: Kevin Doyle?
13	(No response.)
14	MR. FEKETE: The motion is approved.
15	The next order of business is the accounting
16	consultant report, Mr. Anderson.
17	MR. ANDERSON: Tim Anderson from
18	CliftonLarsonAllen. In your board packet there's
19	a financial statement that goes through December
20	31st, and also the checks that we're writing
21	today. Does everybody have a copy of the report?
22	MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: Uh-huh.
23	MR. ANDERSON: Page 2 of the report shows our
24	cash receipts and cash disbursements through
25	December 31st, the trust reimbursement, interest

income, and the user fees totaled \$834,000. And our disbursements, you can see the list of what we're writing checks for and we wrote a total of \$513,000 in disbursements. So our increase in cash for the year is \$320,000. Started the year with 1.6 million, and ended the year with just a little over 2 million in the operating account and the user fee account.

Page 3 shows exactly how that fell out for each month, with the interest that we earned, the checks we wrote, and the cash receipts on the user fees account:

Page 4 shows the budget, the total appropriation, and the cash disbursements for January through December. And then also the checks we write in January that you have today, those go against the 2014 appropriated balances. Did anybody catch that there's a negative number on there?

MR. FEKETE: Uh-huh

MR. ANDERSON: Good. So that's why we had to do a budget transfer, because we didn't have the appropriated balance left in the budget. So there will be a transfer within the system of a \$1,000 from third party contractors, which you had an

available balance of \$12,000 that we hadn't spent yet; so when we transfer that up to "court reporter," we'll be fine on that.

And our total unused budget for '14 was \$600,000. Most of that comes from the Great Lakes Legacy Act, and it's not a "use it or spend it." All we do is take the residual cash in '14 and we request less from the trust next year; so it's not a use it or lose it. It just rolls into the next year.

MR. FEKETE: Any questions for Mr. Anderson?

(No response.)

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

MR. FEKETE: Thank you very much. You have reviewed the accounts payable voucher register for January. We need to have a vote, an approval for this consideration. I will entertain a motion to approve the accounts payable voucher register dated January 21, 2015.

MR. LOPEZ: Motion to approve

MR. FEKETE: Do I have a second?

MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: Second.

MR. FEKETE: Any discussion?

(No response.)

MR. FEKETE: Hearing none, we'll have a roll

1	call vote. John Bakota?
2	MR. BAKOTA: Yes.
3	MR. FEKETE: Henry Rodriguez?
4	MR. HENRY RODRIGUEZ: Yes.
5	MR. FEKETE: Patrick Rodriguez?
6	MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: Yes
7	MR. FEKETE: Ray Lopez?
8	MR. LOPEZ: Yes.
9	MR. FEKETE: John Fekete, I vote yes. Ted
10	Zagar?
11	(No response.)
12	MR. FEKETE: Kevin Doyle?
13	(No response.)
14	MR. FEKETE: The motion is approved. The
15	next order of business is the election of
16	officers. With this being January, our bylaws
17	require us to have an election of officers the
18	first month of the year.
19	MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: Mr. President, since
20	there's no other candidates, I'd like to make
21	that the president, by affirmation, of John
22	Fekete. I nominate him for president. Vice
23	president, Kevin Doyle. Secretary, Henry
24	Rodriguez. And treasurer and financial officer,
25	Ray Lopez. I'd like to make a motion by
- 1	

13

1	affirmation to elect the officers.	
2	MR. FEKETE: Okay. We have a motion, and	
3	I'll entertain a second.	
4	MR. BAKOTA: Second.	
5	MR. FEKETE: We have a second. Roll call	
6	vote. John Bakota?	
7	MR. BAKOTA: Yes.	
8	MR. FEKETE: Henry Rodriguez?	
9	MR. HENRY RODRIGUEZ: Yes.	
10	MR. FEKETE: Patrick Rodriguez?	
11	MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: Yes	
12	MR. FEKETE: Ray Lopez?	
13	MR. LOPEZ: Yes.	
14	MR. FEKETE: John Fekete, I vote yes. Ted	
15	Zagar?	
16	(No response.)	
17	MR. FEKETE: Kevin Doyle	
18	(No response.)	
19	MR. FEKETE: The motion is approved.	
20	MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: Congratulations.	
21	MR. FEKETE: The next order of business is	
22	the finance committee members and chairperson. As	
23	president, I can make the appointment. I appoint	
24	Ray Lopez as chairman of the finance committee,	
25	and the two members will be Kevin Doyle and	
		14

myself.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The next order of business is the BMO Harris Bank trust report. David Alonzo.

MR. ALONZO: David Alonzo. I'm just going to go through the report here. Of course, on Page 1, this is our graph just showing the returns or the portfolio value since 1997. And right below that is the distributions each year from 1997.

Page 2, the trust value as of January 21st was \$5,986,372. That was a positive difference from the December meeting of \$200,636. And, of course, we have not taken any disbursements this year. Going on to the third page, which lists all the accounts that we have and the account numbers. So we have really -- on the far right hand corner, I highlighted it in yellow, there's a few CDs that are going to pay interest at the end of the month. So that \$2,000 gain -- or more than \$2,000 of a gain, we still have a couple CDs that will kick off some interest by the end of the month. will be, of course, reflected in the February meeting. We have two CDs coming due this year. Unfortunately, you have one of the best paying ones, at 2.56 percent, coming due in June, and

2.4

then another one coming due in June also. Of course, when we get up to that point, I'll keep you in touch where the rates are. As great as I'm sure they will be looking then, but we'll see what we can do to give you guys good rates. Any questions?

MR. LOPEZ: No good rate like that.

MR. ALONZO: Yeah. That was a good call back then. That's all I have, unless you have any questions.

MR. FEKETE: Any questions? (No response.)

MR. FEKETE: Thank you very much. Next order of business is the Great Lakes Legacy Act project update. Mr. Wescott.

MR. WESCOTT: I'm going to go first, and then Cheryl will talk about the community engagement plan. Jim Wescott, Tetra Tech. As I mentioned last month, most of the field sampling has been completed, which was funded by EPA; so I've been spending most of my time looking at the data and starting to put together a — both a meeting investigation report and develop clean—up goals and start working toward the feasibility study. One thing that kind of, as we were looking at the

analytical data after last month's meeting, there 1 2 is an area in the Indiana Harbor Canal just north 3 of 151st that has PCBs greater than 50 parts per 4 million, which I don't -- it makes that sediment 5 sort of a different classification for disposal. 6 It's not -- from a practical standpoint, I don't 7 think it's a big deal. It doesn't stop the 8 project but it just makes the handling and some of 9 the planning when we get into designing construction a little different. And I have 10 11 because I only have one point that it is greater 12 than 50, I am going to work with EPA to go back 13 out in the spring and collect more samples in that 14 general vicinity between Chicago and 151st, try to 15 delineate, kind of, the extent of the 16 contamination. So we have a good -- because the 17 cost to deal with that material is going to be 18 higher than just the other dirty sediment; so we want to kind of be able to bracket the quantities 19 20 so in the designing and the cost estimate we know 21 about how much more that's going to cost. 22 MR. BAKOTA: Do we know what depth it goes

MR. BAKOTA: Do we know what depth it goes to?

MR. WESCOTT: It's pretty shallow. The highest was, like, the zero to six-inch. The

23

24

25

surface, essentially, was actually 80. And then, of the top of my head, I can't quite remember, but I want to say a couple feet below that was actually in the teens. And then a little deeper, it was 30.

MR. FEKETE: Where was this again?

MR. WESCOTT: This was north of 151st. It's essentially right near Union Tank Car. The sample point is right --

MR. BAKOTA: There's a clue

MR. FEKETE: It's on the north side of 151st?

MR. WESCOTT: Yes.

MR. FEKETE: Okay.

MR. WESCOTT: Yes. And so I'm going to go out probably next week and try to get a few samples along the -- sediment along the shore line to see -- there's a couple outfall. Now that a lot of the vegetation has died down, there's a couple outfalls that we have seen that we couldn't see in the summer.

MR. BAKOTA: Storm water outfalls?

MR. WESCOTT: Yes. And they may not be like city storm wells. They may just be site, you know, like old outfalls from the site. So I'm going to take a few samples along the bank and try

to see if it is -- you know, to try to bracket, basically, the contamination. And then when we come back in the spring, we'll take a boat on the river and get deeper and additional sediment samples at greater depth to try to get a greater idea how far up and down the canal and how deep the material is. Based on the cores that we've seen, and I mentioned this before, that section of Indiana Harbor, it seems to be -- there's about four feet of stained or darker sediment and then you get into kind of a nice sand. And then, whereas, between Chicago and -- is it Columbus, the next street north?

MR. FEKETE: Uh-huh.

MR. WESCOTT: We didn't see any PCBs greater than ten in that area, and the impacted or just the darker sediment is only another maybe the top two feet. So it's kind of that area that sort of buffers Union Tank Car. Not that they're the site of responsibility, but that area is more impacted than --

MR. BAKOTA: I just wonder if the contamination is being renewed that's still there.

MR. WESCOTT: Well, that's why the other thing we're going to do is we have this other task

_ _

that is part of the EPA piece to sample the outfalls, and we've talked -- last month you asked about E. coli. We're going to start doing that. We've added that to the program.

MR. BAKOTA: Good.

MR. WESCOTT: We'll probably add a couple more outfalls that are near the Union Tank Car site that seem to drain the Union Tank Car to that program. I'll also talk to Greg, Greg Crowley, the East Chicago Sanitary District, to let him know that we're adding a couple sites, because I'm trying to keep him in the loop.

MR. BAKOTA: When you find a concentration of PCBs in the water, do you check the banks on either side?

MR. WESCOTT: That's what we'll do next week and in the spring. We basically took a sample down the center of the channel every several hundred feet.

So I've got a sample that's south of 151st that has almost no PCBs, and I have a sample closer to Chicago that has a PCB hit, but it's not over 50. It's like in the tens or twenties. So I've only got one that's sort of where it is. So my hope is, it doesn't go

south of 151st just because of the difficulty getting in there and dredging it out, because you have to -- you have the railroad bridge, you can't get underneath on the one side and 151st; and if I had to get a dredge in that area, it would be difficult. I could do it, but I'm hoping that it is further north and it would be easier to get in and get out. And, as I mentioned before, based on what we were seeing just from the cores, that's -- that area between 151st and Chicago is the area. We were probably going to dredge that anyway for the sedimentation basin.

So we were already thinking that would be a good location for the sedimentation basin, and it just so happens that there's a TSCA area there too. We'll have to, in the planning process and when they do go to construction, we'll have to think how they want to phase the construction of the basin because some of the material will go out and then have to be handled one way and then some of the material will come out and have to be handled differently. So it's easy to do if you plan it correctly.

1 2 3

MR. BAKOTA: I know I'm probably jumping ahead but on the sediment trap, how -- I mean, how often would that have to be cleared out to keep contamination from going downstream? I mean, or can they even figure that out?

MR. WESCOTT: One of the things that we actually started this week is the sedimentation model — the hydraulic model and the sedimentation model. One of the reasons we're doing that is to basically figure out how big the sedimentation basin needs to be. But it will also tell you how much material will be trapped over time.

MR. BAKOTA: Okay.

MR. WESCOTT: And then that would also go into your long term O & M claim, because if you do build the sedimentation basin, there will be a need longer term to kind of monitor that basin. You know, is it filling up? Does it need to be cleaned off? That also goes — if we do a cap, if we cap certain areas, they're going to be longer term responsibilities that one of the project partners will have to assume.

MR. BAKOTA: Take on, yeah.

MR. WESCOTT: But that's not a great deal of work. I mean, I would assume the sedimentation

basin -- the expectation is that there isn't a lot of new sorts, you know, contamination coming into the river. We're basically still looking at a lot of historical material. So the sedimentation basin, the expectation is it wouldn't be filling up with a lot of hazardous material that would need to be managed, but it's sort of a safety valve.

MR. FEKETE: Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WESCOTT: Both from material that might come in from the Grand Cal part or stuff that flows back from the harbor. So, kind of looking ahead, my expectation is to try to get the remedial investigation report to Fernando by mid February, end of February at the latest. And I will not be at the next meeting because I have a conflict, but I'll get the report in. And then I was thinking I can talk more with Fernando, if it works with your schedule, maybe in March to kind of walk through the different feasible -- or the feasibility options that we're looking at, because I'll be drafting a feasibility study and maybe give you, give the board, a presentation; a kind of "here is what we're looking at" before I finalize the feasibility study. So then I can

24

25

have the feasibility study done late March and then we can start going into the public comment period, which is one of the things Cheryl will talk about. And so by kind of that June time frame, we're pretty much all -- there's a consensus about what we need to do in the various parts of the project area, and then start working on the design. And there are other things in play because, you know, EPA -- as Fernando mentioned, we still need to talk to a lot of other potential project partners that are in the area. Like, we have a meeting with Buckeye Partners on Monday, and EPA is trying to set up some meetings with some other project -- potential project partners, and their input will also sort of affect the design and the potential priorities of what happens first. So there will be a lot more clarity, I think, in March about what we -- what the Waterway Management District wants to do, as well as some of the other project partners that may contribute time or money to the project. so I'll talk with Fernando to see if March works, and I will probably bring in a projector and go through some slides and get feedback.

MR. FEKETE: Very good. Any questions?

4 5

MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: I have a question.
With the impending remediation of the lead,
American Lead down the street from 151st area,
what would be the short-term impact with respect
to remediation such as lead going into that water?
Are we going to be monitoring water quality once
we get into that area?

MR. WESCOTT: I don't think there's an expectation that we're going to be monitoring the water quality. We're at my

MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: Or even that sediment is getting in that area?

MR. WESCOTT: Yeah, I -- I can get back to you, or through Fernando, about the plan on the USS Lead site. The company -- Tetra Tech and another company has a joint venture that we do work for EPA; and the joint venture is actually doing USS Lead too. Cheryl is working on USS Lead from a community involvement point as well. So I can talk to them tomorrow. My assumption would be that there are going to be dust controls in place when they do these residential properties; so the concern that there's going to be dust blowing from those residential properties or other properties' cleanup into the river is going to be very low,

because they're going to be so concerned about dust generating into people's -- you know, into the yards. But if they're going to have -- you know, they're going to spray the area down before they start excavating so that you don't really have that fugitive emission with dust that I think you're concerned about. But I can get with them and see what they're actually going to do and get back to you, but I don't think that's going to really be a source of concern for impacting the waterway.

MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: Thank you.

MR. FEKETE: Any other questions? (No response.)

MR. FEKETE: We look forward to your presentation in March.

MR. WESCOTT: Yes. So hopefully I have a lot more answers, and Cheryl will follow up on community involvement, which will dovetail with what we're doing.

CHERYL VACCARELLO: Hello, I'm Cheryl Vaccarello with Tetra Tech, and I have worked on the USS Lead site for the last -- many years. So you received in your packet a copy, I think, of the draft plan.

MR. FEKETE: Uh-huh.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHERYL VACCARELLO: There's a lot of background information, information about kind of the procedures that are followed under Circular or the NCP as to when you want to involve the community, and according to the project agreement, under the GLLA here, there's really two distinct It's not two points in time. It's just two times that kind of overlap each other that you really want to make sure we get the community involvement, and one is when the alternatives are available under the feasibility study. We would send those out to the community and a fact sheet explaining them and opening up a public comment period. Typically, it's a 30-day public comment If someone asked for an extension, it period. would be up to the board and EPA if they want to grant the extension. And you just, you know, take that as it comes along.

Then the other time frame is almost through this whole process of getting feedback on future use of the project area, the waterways, and the lands. And Jim and I have talked, and at first we were talking about a good time to have some availability sessions

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would be maybe during the predesign phase. in talking with Fernando and Diane, we may want to do that earlier and incorporate that. sometimes I think it's easier for people if they have something to look at to make decisions on and say, "Oh, no, I like that No, I don't like that," and maybe that would trigger some thoughts of what they would like to see, too. So that's up for further discussion exactly when we want to open up to those interviews or availability sessions. I also prepared, and I gave you copies of summary of the outreach activities, and so the first thing is to -- we've submitted the draft. You have a copy of the draft. And then by the end of this month, we'll finalize it. would like to send a copy of the final community engagement plan and an invitation to the special meeting. Fernando was talking about doing this. We're calling them the "adjacent property owners" instead of "the user group." And that meeting would be scheduled for the spring of 2015, which would be after the time when Jim presents to you the alternatives and the alternatives are final.

So it's giving them an opportunity to have a first — second look, I guess, at the alternatives that are out there and getting their input, and during — also, during this process, we'll prepare a fact sheet that will get mailed out which will explain all the alternatives; and then we'll set the comment period; we'll mail the fact sheet out; we'll put an ad in the local papers announcing the period; and we'll want to schedule some public meeting and/or interviews to talk about the alternatives, as well as getting some future use ideas using those combination meetings and interviews.

Once that public comment period is done, we would take all the comments that are received -- I would take all the comments that are received, put them in a report, reach them out to Fernando, and EPA, and Jim, to give some responses to those comments. We would make a responsiveness summary and give it to you, because final decisions on the clean-up options will be done once all the community input is received and looked at.

MR. FEKETE: When would that be? Ball park?

CHERYL VACCARELLO: Well, if we sent it out,

I'm thinking April we should be -- April we would

be sending out the -- having the public comment

period and the clean-up options

MR. WESCOTT: I think so. That's why if I talk about the feasibility options at least in the draft stage here and get feedback from the board, and then I can finalize it, the expectation would be the feasibility study would probably be done by the end of April.

a couple weeks for me to get the fact sheet together and approved and everything and get it out in the mail, so that would start the public comment period time. So probably mid summer is when hopefully we would have all the comments back and the comment period over. And then after — once a decision is made, we would send out another fact sheet to the community members announcing what the clean-up plan is. That would also be another time that we could solicit input on future use ideas. And then once the design is near complete, we would hold other availability sessions within the different neighborhoods to review design and have people ask questions. One

of the challenges, I know, with the USS Lead is getting community involved and getting feedback.

MR. BAKOTA: Yeah.

CHERYL VACCARELLO: And so I'm going to talk with EPA, and I know EPA -- Katie, I think. Just to do some brainstorming ideas of different things we could do to really reach out to the community and get the information out as, you know, as much as we can. And that's pretty much all you can do is get it out there and try to talk to people.

MR. BAKOTA: In the past, the Army Corps of Engineers, I don't think their advertising was aggressive enough, you know. Newspapers, I know in my neighborhood, very few people get a newspaper, you know. We have a local television, and I don't know how many people receive that within the city, you know. I'm almost thinking if something could be distributed through the high schools.

CHERYL VACCARELLO: Typically, churches and schools are good ways of sending flyers home.

MR. BAKOTA: They're really organized.

CHERYL VACCARELLO: I think the water department would send out a flyer within the billing.

3

4

5

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

1617

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

_ 1

25

MR. BAKOTA: That costs \$400, the flyer does. A nominal fee and it reaches everybody.

MR. FEKETE: That goes to all the homeowners.

CHERYL VACCARELLO: Right. So I'll come up
with a plan of different things that we can reach
out to people, putting information out in the
library, flyers, wherever we can, in neighborhood

You know, get it out there. But we found sending information out through the schools is pretty effective. So that kind of leads to the questionnaire that you also have, and if you guys at some point in the near future could take some time and fill this out. One of the things we're

looking for, because I think some of you are in

different neighborhoods and may know other people

meetings, churches, sometimes church bulletins.

that would be good for me to contact and get some more information, and maybe I can get these back to Fernando, and I can work with you to get them from Fernando. And something like this questionnaire would be similar to what we would develop to go out to the community as well. There may be some other questions. You know, one of the

information? I've been in a community where they

important things is how do you want to get

1 use Facebook. 2 MR. LOPEZ: The community, your paper, you 3 had 22 questions. You only gave us 11. CHERYL VACCARELLO: Yeah. Because some, we 4 5 didn't think you guys really needed to do. 6 MR. LOPEZ: That's a lot of questions to send 7 to the community. I don't think they'll be 8 answering all of these. 9 CHERYL VACCARELLO: Typically, with that 10 sample, we sit down one-on-one and talk it through. You don't always ask every question. 17 12 It's just a guiding force. So we don't ask people to write those out, and we have conversations with 13 people to get that information. 14 15 MR. FEKETE: That's more for the questioner 16 than the recipient of the question? 17 CHERYL VACCARELLO: Yeah. 18 MR. TREVINO: The questionnaire that's in 19 your packet that we're asking feedback on was 20 tailored for the board. 21 MR. FEKETE: Right. 22 MR. TREVINO: The process of getting 23 information back from adjacent landowners and the community would be, you know, all tailored for 24 25 But, you know, the exercise today is part them. 33

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

of our goal to get a comprehensive effective community engagement plan, which is part of our project agreement plan with EPA and it was part of the project with Tetra Tech. So we have a follow-up conference call tomorrow to review the plan more thoroughly and try to get to a final draft. So we'll make sure that it's consistent with the project agreement and what we've earlier specified. You know, the board has expressed -you know, that's one of their priorities to make sure the community and stakeholders has an effective voice in our remedial design and eventual cleanup of the canals. So we thought it would be a good idea to have this exercise with the board and with the questionnaire to again make sure we get as comprehensive a plan as we can.

MR. LOPEZ: Can I throw a suggestion out?

Because we're the board. We don't all live around there. We make a lot of decisions. But you can just go door to door. They're low income.

They're not going to watch TV. They have other things. And some of them kids come home from school, believe me, they don't bring everything home. I know my grandkids don't. They lose it.

Go door to door. You can overwhelm people

7 with something like that -- believe me. 2 CHERYL VACCARELLO: Oh, we would not leave a 3 questionnaire like that with people. MR. FEKETE: You would have just a one-page 4 5 flyer. CHERYL VACCARELLO: We could have a one-page 6 7 flyer. 8 MR. LOPEZ: Yeah, simple and -- because 9 there's only certain sections that you have a lot 1.0 of people. 11 MR. TREVINO: Again, this plan is more so 12 that the project team members and the board 13 understands what our plan is to go out and get 14 stakeholder feedback. We wouldn't -- you know, we 15 wouldn't be sending this or sharing this plan with 16 individual community members. But this is more --MR. LOPEZ: I didn't put that on the survey I 17 18 answered. 19 MR. TREVINO: Okay. 20 MR. LOPEZ: But I gave it to you. CHERYL VACCARELLO: Yeah, this is a guide for 21 22 the board to use and to know when to reach out, 23 who to reach out to. You know, we have a -- I 24 think -- a good start of a key contact list. I 25 wanted to be more comprehensive, and I would like

to include the different neighborhood groups, which I didn't have before this.

MR. FEKETE: The community centers like in the West Calumet area. There's, I think, the Martin Luther King Center.

CHERYL VACCARELLO: There is Martin Luther King Center, there's Riley Park where people go to a lot. Yeah, those are the two places that we use when we have meetings for USS Lead, so -- and, actually, we had 30 people come in November; two meetings; so that was pretty good. Are there any questions?

MR. FEKETE: I just have one comment.

Sure.

MR. FEKETE: On reading through this, you have done an outstanding job of capturing the character and the history of this area.

MR. BAKOTA: Yeah.

CHERYL VACCARELLO:

MR. FEKETE: As speaking as one who's been called on from time to time to give a thumbnail historical perspective of what we're doing in this area with regard to the waterway and everything, I think you've done an outstanding job.

CHERYL VACCARELLO: Thank you.

MR. BAKOTA: It does look good, yeah.

CHERYL VACCARELLO: Thank you.

MR. LOPEZ: Very good.

CHERYL VACCARELLO: If there's anything else you would like to see that would help you in future endeavors of yours, just let me know. Thanks very much.

(All board members reply "thank you.")

MR. FEKETE: US Army Corps of Engineers report. Natalie.

MS. MILLS: Good evening. Natalie Mills with the Army Corps of Engineers. Happy New Year to everyone.

The CDF construction: Kokosing and O'Brien & Gere, the contractor is planning to return to the site in the spring of this year. We are currently working with the East Chicago Sanitary District on a modification. I think I mentioned it to you all before. We're attempting to remove some of the water from the pond, you know, in the cells. So they're going to receive some of the discharge water; so we're working with them with both East Chicago Sanitary District and the contractor. The status is, currently with the Corps, we're

working through our contracting process before we can send a request for the proposal to the contractor.

Our goal is to have that modification issued by the end of February and to have the contractor get out and begin installing the discharge line as soon as possible so they can begin discharging prior to dredging.

The permanent well installation contract that was awarded to Plexus, they're still working on their submittals, and they intend to start work in the spring. Plexus, as far as permits, we have contacted EPA regarding the status of our TSCA permit. Some time ago they mentioned possibly having a public meeting in April. We have asked for them to have it earlier. We haven't heard back. We've made a couple phone calls, and we're due to call them again.

Just as a reminder, we submitted the permit back in March of 2013. We were told it takes about a year. So, I don't know. I don't know when we may anticipate the permit. But we do intend to dredge TSCA material. I mean, that's our goal in this dredge season, is to

dredge about 50,000 cubic yards of TSCA material, and a total for the year of \$400,000 cubic yards.

MR. FEKETE: That's double from what you've been doing, isn't it?

MS. MILLS: We did 400,000 in 2012/2013 combination. Then this past year we did about 219,000; and we're planning for 400- this year.

MR. BAKOTA: Has Congress appropriated the funds for the dredging?

MS. MILLS: For this, yes. We have our money for this dredging.

And that also includes a quantity for ArcelorMittal, too. So 45,000 cubic yards is what they had told us last fall; so that is included in the 400,000.

MR. BAKOTA: So your dredging will probably go further into the year than it usually does?

MS. MILLS: Yes. Yes. Especially, since we don't know when we're going to get that permit. The whole season is really being driven by when we get the TSCA permit. We don't want to give them a large quantity to start, because we have to use some of that 400,000 as a cover; so we have to place and we have to cover in its entirety.

MR. FEKETE: Yeah.

MS. MILLS: So we're thinking it will be about 200,000 cubic yards for cover; so we don't want to get too far ahead of ourselves and then dredge. So a lot of it will be dredged -- our schedule will be driven by the receipt of the TSCA.

As far as the Feddeler parcel, I'll let Ellen speak to that. The parkway improvement, they're not working right now. I think they said they're going to start in — they're going to finish it from that main gate north, in the spring. They're waiting for weather again, so, but that is on the top of their schedule.

Fernando, for you, I was wondering if you ever heard anything back on that mural that we had suggested some time ago?

MR. TREVINO: I did hear back. I'm glad you brought that up, and the city is interested in moving forward with it and asked that if the Corps could coordinate that with Steve Segura with the multimedia. I'll get you the contact information.

MS. MILLS: Okay. That's all I have at this point.

MR. FEKETE: Any questions for Natalie?

(No response.)

2.0

MR. FEKETE: Thank you very much.

MR. LOPEZ: Thank you, Natalie.

MR. FEKETE: Next order of business is our attorney's report. Miss Gregory.

MS. GREGORY: Ellen Gregory, with Bamberger, Foreman, Oswald & Hahn. There's a lot more syllables that Ellen Gregory Law.

The consent decree, we have our next biweekly call tomorrow morning. At the last call, BP reported that they were supposed to be having an internal meeting to discuss the consent decree and the AOC, the administrative order on consent. So we're hoping tomorrow they'll have made some progress. They'll need to discuss what BP has decided internally with EPA; and then, hopefully, within the next month or two, we'll have a revised consent decree for the entire group to review.

On the Feddeler issue, we had a call today with our third appraiser who was actually recommended by the Corps. So we're hoping that appraiser will be okay with the Corps. He will be presenting a proposal which we'll then forward on to the Corps' lawyer, Paul Sacks,

and hopefully move that forward.

The user fees: Fernando and I have been in the discussion with the attorney general's office. We have just one user fee remaining who hasn't paid. It's an interesting situation where the company that had been assessed the user fees is now dissolved administratively but an affiliated company still owns the parcel of property; so we're trying to figure out with the attorney general's office how to proceed on that. And I'm pretty sure that all the other user fees are paid.

PCA: I've left a couple of messages with Kim Szabo. We're going to try to push to get that moving again, especially since the consent decree is moving forward. And, hopefully, we'll move forward on that quickly.

And that's all I have. Any questions?

MR. LOPEZ: Risk management insurance?

MS. GREGORY: Right. That's something we're probably going to include in our discussions on the PCA revisions. We have been discussing with insurance companies about insurance coverage, and we're not successful in doing that; so we're going to try to tie it into the discussions with the

1	Corps.
2	MR. LOPEZ: All right You'll update us on
3	that?
4	MS. GREGORY: Yes.
5	MR. FEKETE: Okay. Any questions?
6	(No response.)
7	MR. FEKETE: Thank you very much. Any new
8	business to come before the board?
9	MR. TREVINO: I just wanted to mention that
10	Diana O'Malley here is from EPA with the Great
11	Lakes Legacy Act, and I know she's got a million
12	things on her list to do so I wanted to thank her
13	for attending today. I don't know if you wanted
14	to add anything.
15	MS. O'MALLEY: Thanks. I just wanted you to
16	know I'm still interested in working on the
17	project. It is nice to hear what's going on, like
18	updates from the Corps as well.
19	MR. FEKETE: Thank you. Any other business?
20	(No response.)
21	MR. FEKETE: Any public comments?
22	(No response.)
23	MR. FEKETE: Next board meeting February 18,
24	at 5:00 p.m. at this facility. I will now
25	entertain a motion for adjournment

1	MR. PATRICK RODRIGUEZ: So moved.
2	MR. FEKETE: Motion to accept.
3	MR. BAKOTA: Second.
4	MR. FEKETE: Any discussion?
5	MR. BAKOTA: No discussion.
6	MR. FEKETE: Okay. All in favor, signify by
7	saying aye.
8	(All signify aye.)
9	MR. FEKETE: Motion approved. This meeting
10	is adjourned.
11	THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 5:59 P.M.
12	= * =
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
ł	44

CERTIFICATE

I, Dawn M. Iseminger, Registered Professional Reporter (RPR), and Notary Public within and for the County of Porter, State of Indiana, do hereby certify that I appeared at The City of East Chicago, Engineering/Annex Building, 4444 Railroad Avenue, East Chicago, Indiana, on the 21st day of January, 2015, to report the proceedings had of the District Board of Directors' Meeting.

I further certify that I then and there reported in machine shorthand the proceedings given at said time and place, and that the testimony was then reduced to typewriting from my original shorthand notes, and the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of said proceedings had.

Dated this 15th day of

2015.

Dawn M. Iseminger, RER

My Commission expires: 7/22/2017